UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/552,109 | 10/04/2005 | Andrew Philip Churchill | CAF-34102/03 | 4175 |
| | 7590 06/23/200 ASS, SPRINKLE,AN I | EXAMINER | | |
| PO BOX 7021 | | THOMPSON, KENNETH L | | |
| TROY, MI 480 | 07-7021 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 3672 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/23/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | 10/552,109 | CHURCHILL, ANDREW PHILIP | | |
| | Examiner | A 4 1 14 | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | Kenneth Thompson | 3672 | |
|---|--|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appea | rs on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appear for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods: | he same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v | Appeal. To avoid abar , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | visory Action, or (2) the date set forth i er than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exteunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sheet forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 nsion and the corresponding amount of ortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | te extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliant filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but (a) They raise new issues that would require further cons | sideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or | | lucing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116) | | cted claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1215. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | t canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 101 and 102. Claim(s) objected to: 72-76. | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) rejected: 70, 71, 73-75, 77-100 and 103-109. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over the showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and the sufficient reasons who is not a sufficient reason which is not a suf | ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attach | ed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but o | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (F13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | /Kenneth Thompson/ Primary Examiner | | |

Art Unit: 3672

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Claim 72 include limitations directed to pumping the drift member to engage a restriction and identifying the location of the restriction. New claim 110 requires in the last two lines the alternative of engaging the "said" profile and does not include a separate restriction.

Claim 76 include limitations directed to the restriction being in the tubing engaged by the drift member and identyfing a volume of pumped fluid. New claim 110 requires the alternative of the drift member engaging the restriction, wherein the restriction is not claimed in the tubing and "the" volume lacks antecedent basis.

Limitations directed to determining whether the throughbore is obstructed and unobstructed by identyfing the location of a restriction and the profile, respectively or the like, may obviate the need for alternative recitations.

Limitations directed to determining whether the throughbore is obstructed and unobstructed by identyfing a volume representative of a restriction location and the profile location, or the like, may obviate the need for alternative recitations.